Literal compliance with the FSAR update schedule of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) would result in an FSAR update which would be incomplete and not adequately reflect the actual design of the facility.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The proposed action to allow the licensee an additional 6 months to update the IP3 FSAR is administrative in nature. The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the probability or consequences of accidents will not increase, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action is administrative in nature and involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. However, as an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action considered are the same.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the ''Final Environmental Statement for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Station Unit No. 3,'' dated February 1975.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 17, 1995, the staff consulted with the New York State official, Jack Spath of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated June 20, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC, and at the White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of September 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ledyard B. Marsh,

Director, Project Directorate I–1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–23177 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Application for a License To Export a Utilization Facility

Pursuant to 10 CFR 110.70(b) ''Public notice of receipt of an application'', please take notice that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has received the following application for an export license. Copies of the application are on file in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Public Document Room located at 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC.

A request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene may be filed within 30 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register. Any request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene shall be served by the requestor or petitioner upon the applicant, the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555; the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and the Executive Secretary, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

In its review of the application for a license to export a utilization facility as defined in 10 CFR Part 110 and noticed herein, the Commission does not evaluate the health, safety or environmental effects in the recipient nation of the facility to be exported. The information concerning this application follows:

Name of applicant	ABB Combustion Engineering., Inc.	Description of facility	End use
Date of Application	10 August 1995	2 (Two) Nuclear Power Reactors/ 1000 MWe (ea) pressurized water reactors/Ulchin units 5 & 6.	Commercial Generation of Electricity.
Date Received	15 August 1995		
Application Number	XR 163		
Country of Destination	Republic of Korea		

Dated this 7th day of September 1995 at Rockville, Maryland.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ronald D. Hauber,

Director, Division of Nonproliferation, Exports and Multilateral Relations, Office of International Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–23180 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Generic Letter 88–20, Supplement 5, Individual Plant Examination of External Events for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of issuance.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued Generic Letter 88–20, Supplement 5 to (1) notify all holders of operating licenses (except those licenses that have been amended to possession-only status) or construction permits for nuclear power reactors of modifications in the recommended scope of seismic reviews that are performed as part of individual plant examinations of external events (IPEEE) for the focused-scope and full-